



**University of  
Zurich<sup>UZH</sup>**

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2017

---

## **Testing the importance of a common ectomycorrhizal network for dipterocarp seedling growth and survival in tropical forests of Borneo**

Brearley, Francis Q ; Saner, Philippe ; Uchida, Ayuho ; Burslem, David F R P ; Hector, Andy ; Nilus, Reuben ; Scholes, Julie D ; Egli, Simon

**Abstract:** Background: Connections between mature trees and seedlings via ectomycorrhizal (EcM) hyphal networks existing in dipterocarp-dominated tropical rain forests of South-east Asia could have strong implications for seedling growth and survival and the maintenance of high diversity in such forests. Aim: To test whether EcM hyphal network connections are important for the growth and survival of dipterocarp seedlings. Methods: We conducted four independent experiments that prevented contact of experimental seedlings with an EcM network by using a series of fine meshes and/or plastic barriers. We measured the growth and survival (and foliar  $^{13}C$  in one experiment) of seedlings of six dipterocarp species over intervals ranging from 11 to 29 months. Results: Seedling growth (diameter, height or leaf number) was unaffected by exclusion from the EcM network in three experiments and there were no differences in foliar  $^{13}C$  values in the fourth. Seedling survival was reduced following exclusion from the EcM network in one experiment. Our results give little support to the hypothesis that dipterocarp seedlings growing in the shaded forest understorey benefit from being connected, through a common EcM network, to surrounding trees. Conclusions: We suggest that our negative results, in contrast to studies conducted in low diversity boreo-temperate or tropical forests, are due to these high diversity forests lacking host species-specific EcM fungi, and therefore providing little opportunity for adaptive support of seedlings via hyphal networks

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17550874.2017.1283649>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-131708>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Brearley, Francis Q; Saner, Philippe; Uchida, Ayuho; Burslem, David F R P; Hector, Andy; Nilus, Reuben; Scholes, Julie D; Egli, Simon (2017). Testing the importance of a common ectomycorrhizal network for dipterocarp seedling growth and survival in tropical forests of Borneo. *Plant Ecology and Diversity*, 9(5-6):563-576.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17550874.2017.1283649>

# Testing the importance of a common ectomycorrhizal network for dipterocarp seedling growth and survival in tropical forests of Borneo

Francis Q. Brearley<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Philippe Saner<sup>3,+</sup>, Ayuho Uchida<sup>4</sup>, David F. R. P. Burslem<sup>4</sup>, Andy Hector<sup>3,5</sup>, Reuben Nilus<sup>6</sup>, Julie D. Scholes<sup>1</sup> and Simon Egli<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK; <sup>2</sup> School of Science and the Environment, Manchester Metropolitan University, Chester Street, UK; <sup>3</sup> Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland; <sup>4</sup> School of Biological Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland, UK; <sup>5</sup> Department of Plant Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK; <sup>6</sup> Forest Research Centre, Sabah Forestry Department, Sandakan, Sabah, Malaysia; <sup>7</sup> Swiss Federal Research Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape, Birmensdorf, Switzerland

+ = Joint first authors

\*Corresponding author. Email: f.q.brearley@mmu.ac.uk

## Abstract

**Background:** Connections between mature trees and seedlings *via* ectomycorrhizal (EcM) hyphal networks existing in dipterocarp-dominated tropical rain forests of South-east Asia could have strong implications for seedling growth and survival and the maintenance of high diversity in such forests.

**Aim:** To test whether EcM hyphal network connections are important for the growth and survival of dipterocarp seedlings.

**Methods:** We conducted four independent experiments that prevented contact of experimental seedlings with an EcM network by using a series of fine meshes and/or plastic barriers. We measured the growth and survival (and foliar  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  in one

experiment) of seedlings of six dipterocarp species over intervals ranging from 11 to 29 months.

**Results:** Seedling growth (diameter, height or leaf number) was unaffected by exclusion from the EcM network in three experiments and there were no differences in foliar  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values in the fourth. Seedling survival was reduced following exclusion from the EcM network in one experiment. Our results give little support to the hypothesis that dipterocarp seedlings growing in the shaded forest understorey benefit from being connected, through a common EcM network, to surrounding trees.

**Conclusions:** We suggest that our negative results, in contrast to studies conducted in low diversity boreo-temperate or tropical forests, are due to these high diversity forests lacking host species-specific EcM fungi, and therefore providing little opportunity for adaptive support of seedlings *via* hyphal networks.

**Keywords:** Borneo, dipterocarps, ectomycorrhizas, mycorrhizal networks, source-sink relationships

## Introduction

Mycorrhizas are a symbiotic association between specialised root-inhabiting fungi and the roots of living plants. The plant provides the fungus with carbon derived from photosynthesis, and, in return, the fungus may improve the nutrient uptake, growth, water relations, pathogen and heavy metal resistance of the plant (van der Heijden and Sanders 2002; Smith and Read 2008 and references therein). Although the majority of tropical trees form arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) associations, an important minority form ectomycorrhizal (EcM) associations including members of the Dipterocarpaceae (Brearley 2012). Dipterocarp trees dominate the forests of South-east Asia (Slik et al. 2003, 2009), and there are more than 250 species on the island of Borneo alone (Ashton 2004). Their seeds are produced every 3-8 years in mast-fruiting events (Curran et al. 1999; Sakai et al. 2006; Brearley et al. 2007a) after which they germinate and become colonised rapidly by EcM fungi (Lee and Alexander 1996). The main method of colonisation is from the hyphae of fungi already present and forming network in the soil radiating out from roots of adjacent adult trees (Alexander et al. 1992) – during the process of EcM colonisation seedlings become ‘connected’ to this network. After a mast-fruiting event, dipterocarp seedlings are found at high densities close to parent trees forming seedling banks where they are limited in their growth and survival in the shaded forest understorey.

Numerous studies have shown the existence of EcM networks in various forest ecosystems with shared fungal species linkages between adults and seedlings (Beiler et al. 2010; Diédhiou et al. 2011; Michaëlla Ebenye et al. in press) and Connell and Lowman (1989) hypothesised that the dominance of dipterocarps in South-east Asian lowland evergreen rain forests was linked to the ability of newly germinated seedlings to link into this EcM-mediated resource acquisition network. Studies conducted in

lowland tropical forests of Cameroon found that isolation of seedlings of *Paraberlinia* *bifoliolata* (Leguminosae) from roots and EcM fungi reduced seedling biomass and survival (Onguene and Kuyper 2002), and a similar study in Guyana showed that *Dicymbe corymbosa* (Leguminosae) had reduced growth and survival when isolated from an EcM hyphal network using fine meshes (McGuire 2007). Contrasting with these findings, seedlings of only one of three Caesalpinioideae legume species in Cameroon had a higher growth rate in the presence of adult trees and their associated roots and EcM fungi (Newbery et al. 2000). The cause of this difference in outcome between studies in different locations is unknown, and further research is required to extend the range of environments where this is examined including both high and low diversity sites. Whether the connection into an EcM hyphal network has implications for the high species richness observed in dipterocarp-dominated tropical rain forests remains unsolved, and clearly, then, it is important to improve our knowledge of the role of EcM networks in facilitating the regeneration of tropical forest trees.

The benefits of being connected into this hyphal ‘wood-wide web’ have been reported from boreo-temperate forests (Simard et al. 2012). For example, carbon has been shown to move between plants or seedlings that form a hyphal network in a 'source-sink' fashion whereby plants that are photosynthesising at a rapid rate, such as those under higher irradiance, pass carbon to those that have lower rates of photosynthesis, such as those which are strongly shaded (Francis and Read 1984; Simard et al. 1997; Klein et al. 2016). Support *via* an EcM hyphal network may therefore be beneficial for the survival of seedlings that are growing below the light compensation point in shaded understorey environments. Francis and Read (1984) were the first to show that carbon could move between plants via an AM hyphal network, but not until the milestone study of Simard et al. (1997) was net movement of carbon in

EcM systems shown: they found that 6.6% of carbon fixed in *Betula papyrifera* (Betulaceae) was transferred to *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Pinaceae) and that 45% of this transferred carbon was found in the plant shoots (*i.e.* not fungal structures). Most recently, Klein et al. (2016) showed transfer of carbon from *Picea abies* (Pinaceae) adult trees to roots of adjacent EcM species. However, the ecological importance of this network has been under considerable debate as inter-plant carbon transfer is a complex and variable process. From a phytocentric view, there is a challenge in explaining how this process could be adaptive as it is only likely to be selected for if adults are transferring beneficial compounds, such as carbon, to kin. If considered mycocentrically, however, then the fungus will simply be moving compounds to where they are most required at a given point in time.

EcM colonisation in shade tolerant dipterocarps has been shown to improve the growth of seedlings under nursery conditions although far fewer studies have shown a similar benefit under natural field conditions (Brearley 2011, 2012). We report four independent studies on the island of Borneo, using seedlings of six dipterocarp species with contrasting ecological characteristics. We hypothesised that seedlings that were experimentally excluded from an EcM network would display slower growth rates and reduced survival than seedlings that were connected to the network.

## **Materials and methods**

### *Rationale*

In the first three experiments reported, we planted seedlings surrounded by meshes of various pore size with the intention of creating a series of barriers to in-growth by plant roots and fungal hyphae. Therefore, the control treatments allowed free access to fine roots and fungal hyphae, a large mesh treatment had a fine pore-size mesh (35-50  $\mu\text{m}$ )

to prevent the access of fine roots but allow access by fungal hyphae and a small mesh treatment had a very fine pore-size mesh (0.5-1.0  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and/or a severing treatment to prevent access to both roots and fungal hyphae. It was assumed that seedlings in which fungal hyphae were allowed access through the meshes had the potential to become colonised by hyphae present in the soil outside the meshes, and therefore connect into the EcM hyphal network, whereas those seedlings in the treatments where hyphal access was restricted would only be able to form EcMs *via* spores or hyphal fragments present within their enclosed rooting volume, and would therefore not connect into the EcM network outwith the meshes. This approach has been used successfully to control mycorrhizal colonisation and partition of soil respiration fluxes in previous experiments (Johnson et al. 2001; Heinemeyer et al. 2007; Vallack et al. 2012). A number of the seedlings were raised in a nursery before being transplanted into the forest and, based on prior observations (Brearley 2003), we are confident they were all colonised by EcM fungi, albeit those more common of nursery conditions (*e.g.* Brearley 2006; Brearley et al. 2003, 2007b; Saner et al. 2011). Whilst ‘priority effects’ of EcM colonisation have often been found to affect subsequent competitive replacement by other EcM species (Kennedy et al. 2009), replacement of nursery EcMs with those present in forest soil has been seen within six months for studies in Peninsular Malaysia (Chang et al. 1994, 1995) and, given that the length of all our studies was over at least 11 months, we do not consider this to have affected our results.

In one experiment we tested whether carbon was measurably transferred from adult trees to seedlings through an EcM hyphal network by trenching the seedlings in order to isolate them from the EcM network and then determining the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of newly produced leaves. This approach is based on the fact that canopy leaves have a less negative  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  signature than seedlings due to differences in the atmospheric-to-

intercellular carbon dioxide ratio (O'Leary 1988; Farquhar et al. 1989) and the isotopic signature of the source carbon dioxide in the ambient air taken up for photosynthesis (Medina and Minchin 1980; Medina et al. 1986, 1991; Buchman et al. 1997). For example, if the isotopic difference between adult trees and seedlings were 5‰, using a two-source mixing model, receipt of 10% of carbon by seedlings from adult trees would result in those connected to the EcM network having a foliar  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  value 0.5 ‰ closer to adults than trenched seedlings.

#### *Study species*

Six dipterocarp species (Table 1) were selected, based on their differences in shade tolerance and maximum growth rates (Experiments 1-3), edaphic preferences (Experiment 3), and on their availability at the start of the experiments (Experiments 1-4).

#### *Experiment 1. EcM-network exclusion and fungicide addition effects on two dipterocarp species*

This experiment was carried out in the northern part of the Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve, on alluvial soils (5° 52' N, 117° 56' E; Fox 1973; Nilus 2004). Four plots of ca. 7 m x 7 m were cleared of the understorey vegetation and some smaller trees to reduce heterogeneity in the light environment within and between plots. Six-month-old seedlings of *Hopea nervosa* and *Parashorea tomentella* obtained from the INFAPRO nursery, Danum Valley, Sabah that had been potted in forest-derived soil (see Saner et al. 2011 and Paine et al. 2012a for nursery conditions), were planted into the four plots in March 2000. In each plot, 30 seedlings of each of the two species were randomly allocated to planting locations ca. 50 cm apart. Three treatments and two controls were



applied to the seedlings: (1) Control: no meshes were used, fungal hyphae and other roots could fully interact with the planted seedling; (2) Sub-Control: a 1 mm pore-size polyester mesh cylinder was installed around the seedling; the aim of this mesh was to attempt to provide some rigidity and to protect the smaller pore-sized meshes in the other treatments from larger soil invertebrates; (3) Root exclusion (-R): one layer of 35  $\mu$ m pore-size nylon mesh (within the 1 mm pore-size polyester mesh cylinder) was installed around the seedlings to allow connection to a mycorrhizal hyphal network; (4) Root and mycorrhizal exclusion (-RM): two layers of 0.5  $\mu$ m pore-size nylon mesh (within the 1 mm pore-size polyester mesh cylinder) were installed around the seedlings; the cylinders were twisted slightly every four weeks to break any hyphal connections that might have occurred through the meshes; (5) Fungicide (-RM+F): as the -RM treatment but with the addition of Mancozeb fungicide (Bio-Dithane 945, PBI Home & Garden Ltd., Enfield, Middlesex, UK) bi-weekly at a rate of 0.08 g per seedling in 50 ml of water to control the growth of EcMs on the seedling roots (Brearley 2003). All the mesh barriers were sewn into cylinders of 7 cm diameter with a lip of 2 cm above ground to prevent hyphal entry and dug into the soil to a depth of 25 cm using an auger to create a hole; they remained open at the bottom. All meshes were obtained from, and sewn by, Plastok Associates Ltd. (Birkenhead, Wirral, UK). Apart from the -RM+F treatment all other treatments were given 50 ml of water bi-weekly to control for the addition of water with the fungicide. Other than this bi-weekly fungicide solution or water addition, the seedlings were given supplemental water twice weekly for the first month following planting. Leaf litter and twigs lying across the meshes were removed at monthly intervals to prevent fungal hyphae entering the cylinders *via* this potential pathway. Other vegetation was hand-weeded from the plots throughout the experimental period.

*Experiment 2. EcM-network exclusion and distance to adult tree effects on two dipterocarp species*

This experiment was conducted in the Malua Forest Reserve (5° 05' N, 117° 38' E) that was selectively logged for timber in the 1980s (Marsh and Greer 1992). Twenty large trees (mean dbh = 69.7 ± SD 15.1 cm) of either *Dryobalanops lanceolata* or *Shorea parvifolia* were chosen within the Sabah Biodiversity Experiment (Hector et al. 2011; Saner et al. 2012). Trees were only selected if they were among the largest trees and no other large dipterocarp or Fagaceae trees were within 15 m of the plots to ensure that the EcM network of the focal tree was closest to the planted seedlings. At every focal tree, one plot (ca. 1.5 m x 2 m) was cleared of understorey vegetation to reduce within and between plot heterogeneity in the light environment under the tree canopy (2-4 m away from the trunk) and one plot was established and cleared of understorey vegetation outside the tree canopy (15-17 m away from the trunk), based on the assumption that the tree canopy approximately reflected the extension of the rooting system (Baillie and Mamit 1983; Katayama et al. 2009). One control and two treatments were applied to the seedlings: (1) Control: no mesh or tube was used, fungal hyphae and other roots could fully interact with the planted seedling; (2) Root exclusion (-R): seedlings were planted into a PVC tube (15 cm diameter x 70 cm depth) covered at the bottom with 50-µm pore-size mesh allowing fungal hyphae to grow into the tube; (3) Root and mycorrhiza exclusion (-RM): seedlings were planted into a PVC tube as above but with a 1-µm pore-size mesh to prevent the entry of fungal hyphae. The meshes were made of monofilament PET (Sefar PETEX, Heiden, Switzerland) and were glued between the bottom of the PVC tube and an additional PVC ring (15 cm diameter x 5 cm depth) with silica and aluminium tape. In every plot, 12 seedlings were planted at a

spacing of ca. 50 cm and dug into the soil to a depth of 70 cm. Six seedlings were the same species as the focal tree and six seedlings were of the other tree species. All seedlings were raised in a local nursery at the Malua Field Station, Malua Forest Reserve, Sabah, with conditions similar to those at the INFAPRO nursery noted earlier, and ca. 6 months old and 0.5 m tall when planted into the field. Seedlings were randomly allocated and planted in September 2006. Seedlings were watered once at the beginning of the experiment. Leaf litter and twigs lying across the meshes were removed at monthly intervals to prevent fungal hyphae entering the cylinders. Other vegetation was hand-weeded from the plots throughout the experimental period. An index of light interception (% of canopy openness at the plot level) was measured at the beginning, middle (6 months) and end (11 months) of the experiment, using a Spherical Densiometer Model A.

### *Experiment 3. EcM-network exclusion and soil type effects on four dipterocarp species*

This experiment was carried out in the northern and central parts of Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve on two contrasting soil types (Nilus 2004; Dent et al. 2006). Ten understorey plots of ca. 5 m x 5 m were chosen within both the sandstone and the alluvial soil types respectively, and understorey vegetation cleared to reduce heterogeneity in the light environment within and between plots. Within each plot, seedlings of *Shorea beccariana*, *S. multiflora* (both sandstone soil specialists), *Dryobalanops lanceolata* and *Parashorea tomentella* (both alluvial soil specialists) were planted in April 2003 at an equal spacing of ca. 1 m (seedlings were grown from seeds collected within the Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve during the 2002 mast-fruiting event and were ca. 6 months old when transplanted). They were subjected to three treatments and one control: (1) Control: no tube or mesh was used, fungal hyphae and

other roots could fully interact with the planted seedling; (2) Sub-Control: seedlings were planted in PVC tubes of 15 cm in diameter and 35 cm in depth that were open at the bottom (with 5 cm above the soil surface). Three rectangular windows of 7 cm width x 20 cm depth were made in the tube, allowing both mycorrhizal hyphae and plant roots to penetrate. Six small holes (of 5 mm diameter) were cut in the tubes at the level of the soil surface to aid in drainage. (3) Root exclusion (-R): seedlings were planted in PVC tubes as above and the windows were covered in 35  $\mu$ m pore-size mesh (Plastok Associates Ltd., Birkenhead, Wirral, UK), allowing only mycorrhizal hyphae to penetrate. (4) Root and mycorrhizal exclusion (-RM): Seedlings were planted in PVC tubes but there were no rectangular windows in the tubes and a knife was used to cut around the edges of the tubes once per week to sever any fungal hyphae that might have entered through the small drainage holes. Once planted, seedlings were not given additional water and there were no on-going manipulations (such as removal of leaf litter and twigs lying across the piping or weeding of vegetation). The two sandstone species (*Shorea beccariana* and *S. multiflora*) grown in the alluvial plots were harvested in July 2004 (after 15 months) due to high mortality rates; all other seedling/soil type combinations were followed for 29 months. An index of light interception (% of canopy openness) was measured at the beginning of the experiment with hemispherical photography using a Minolta X-700 camera with a Rokkor 7.5 mm fisheye lens; images were subsequently analysed using Gap Light Analyser (Frazer et al. 1999).

*Experiment 4. EcM-network effects on carbon isotope ratios on one dipterocarp species*

Twenty areas with seedling banks of *Shorea multiflora* were selected in March 2000 in two separate areas of Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve. Ten areas were in the vicinity of research plots in the northern part of the Reserve and another ten were along a trail

running north-south through the Reserve. In each area, a circular plot of 68.5 cm diameter was trenched to a depth of 5-10 cm (varying with the local microtopography) and a plastic barrier was placed in the trench. An equally-sized and shaped plot (situated between 0.45-3.2 m from the trenched plot; mean: 1.25 m) was marked out using a circle of plastic, lain on the forest floor but remained otherwise unaltered in order to act as a control. Each plot contained a mean of 13.5 ( $\pm$  4.9 SD) seedlings of which 11.8 ( $\pm$  4.7 SD) were *Shorea multiflora*. The number of leaves and height of each seedling was recorded so that after 13 months, one leaf that had been produced during that interval was randomly selected from one seedling within each plot. The leaves were dried at 50° C for at least one week, ground in liquid nitrogen and a sample of 1 mg was analysed for  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  (PDZ Europa ANCA-GSL preparation module connected to a 20-20 isotope ratio mass spectrometer, Northwich, Cheshire, UK). Isotope ratios were calculated as:  $\delta^{13}\text{C} (\text{‰}) = (\text{R}_{\text{sample}}/\text{R}_{\text{standard}} - 1) \times 1000$  where R is the isotope ratio of  $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$  of either the sample or the standard (Pee Dee Belemnite). In addition, one leaf was collected from the canopy of eight large individuals of *Shorea multiflora* (40-45 m tall; C. R. Maycock pers. comm.; R. N. Thewlis pers. comm.) and analysed for  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  as above.

#### *Seedling measurements*

Non-destructive measurements of seedling height (to the apical meristem), basal diameter and leaf number as well as survival rate were taken periodically. In Experiment 1, six measurements were taken over 24 months (March 2000-February 2002), in Experiment 2, three measurements were taken over 11 months (September 2006-August 2007), in Experiment 3, 10 measurements were taken over 29 months (April 2003-September 2005). Seedlings that died or were severely damaged by

mammals or tree/branch falls, where the meshes were damaged or where there was poor drainage and the tubes became waterlogged (Experiment 2 only) were removed from the growth analyses. For the individual growth analyses a total of n=233 (Experiment 1), n=267 (Experiment 2), and n=317 (Experiment 3) observations were included. Only seedlings grown under dark conditions (<5% canopy openness) were included in the analysis for Experiment 2.

### *Statistical analyses*

Based on an initial screen, we assumed linear growth, as individual seedlings showed relatively constant increases in diameter, height and leaf number over time. The linear model was fitted for every seedling and the individual regression slope (r) extracted. The slopes were then standardised by dividing by the mean height, diameter or leaf number of the last measurement, termed in this paper as relative growth rate (Paine et al. 2012b). A linear mixed-effects model for each study was carried out in R 3.2.0 (R Development Core Team 2015), using the *nlme* library (Pinheiro and Bates 2000). Treatment and species (all experiments), plus planting distance (Experiment 2), or habitat (soil) type (Experiment 3) were treated as fixed effects; as we were specifically interested in selected species effects they were included as fixed, rather than random, effects, plot was included as a random effect. Unequal variance was observed and accounted for by defining a linear increase in variance with time (Experiment 1) or light level by species (Experiments 2 and 3). In the case of Experiment 2, adding conspecificity/heterospecificity did not significantly improve the fit of the model (in all cases:  $\chi^2 < 16.5$ ,  $P > 0.15$ ) so this variable was removed for ease of comparison with the other studies. Analysis of survival rates was made on binomial count data of seedlings that survived compared to those that died, including the same structure of fixed and

random effects as outlined above, with the function *glmer()* and a binomial distribution in the *lme4* library (Bates et al. 2015). The statistical tests are reported based on the analysis of relative growth rates for all three non-destructive measurements (height, diameter and leaf number) and for survival, but for simplicity only the increase in diameter is shown graphically (for additional graphical representation of all non-destructive measurements see supplementary material). We present the *F*-test or Chi-square (survival analysis) statistic with associated *P*-values obtained through the *anova()* command and *t*-test statistic with associated *P*-values obtained through the *summary()* command for main effects and their interactions as outlined in Tables 2, 4 and 5. Note that with non-orthogonal designs in complex models the outcome from the *anova()* command and the *summary()* command may differ slightly (Hector et al. 2010; Hector 2015). Experiment 4 was analysed using a straightforward one-way ANOVA to compare foliar  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values between large trees and trenched and untrenched seedlings.

## Results

### *Experiment 1*

*Diameter growth.* For relative diameter growth rate, significant main effects of treatment and species were observed (treatment:  $F_{4,220}=12.8$ ,  $P<0.0001$ ; species:  $F_{1,220}=19.2$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) and there was also a significant interaction between treatment and species ( $F_{4,220}=2.7$ ,  $P<0.05$ ). For *Hopea nervosa*, fungicide addition (-RM+F) significantly reduced growth by 40% (mean  $\pm$  95% CI: 5-75%) compared to the seedlings of the root exclusion treatment (-R) ( $t_{4,220}=2.2$ ,  $P<0.05$ ), however for *Parashorea tomentella*, fungicide addition (-RM+F) did not affect diameter growth rate. In contrast to our hypothesis, seedlings of *Parashorea tomentella* in the root and mycorrhizal exclusion treatment (-RM) grew significantly ( $t_{4,220}=3.1$ ,  $P<0.01$ ) faster

than seedlings of the root exclusion treatment (-R) (mean  $\pm$  95% CI: 38%  $\pm$  19-50%) (Figure 1 and Table 2, supplementary material Figure S1).

*Height growth.* There was no effect of the treatments on height growth rates but *Parashorea tomentella* showed a significantly faster relative height growth rate than *Hopea nervosa* ( $F_{1,220}=4.1$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) (Table 2, Figure S2 a and b).

*Leaf growth.* Relative growth rate in leaf number showed significant main effects of the treatment ( $F_{4,220}=5.0$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) and species ( $F_{1,220}=116.3$ ,  $P<0.0001$ ). *Hopea nervosa* seedlings grew significantly faster than those of *Parashorea tomentella* ( $t_{1,220}=6.0$ ,  $P<0.0001$ ). No significant treatment effects were observed for *Parashorea tomentella*, however for *Hopea nervosa*, control seedlings grew significantly faster than both seedlings of the root (-R) and mycorrhizal exclusion (-RM) treatment ( $t_{4,220}=2.2$ ,  $P<0.05$  and  $t_{4,220}=2.9$ ,  $P<0.01$  respectively). Fungicide addition significantly reduced growth compared to control seedlings ( $t_{4,220}=4.2$ ,  $P<0.0001$ ) (Table 2, Figure S3 a and b).

*Survival.* No effects of the treatments were observed for seedling survival but seedlings of *Hopea nervosa* showed a significantly greater survival rate compared to *Parashorea tomentella* ( $\chi^2=6.4$ ,  $P=0.01$ ) (Tables 2 and 3).

## Experiment 2

*Diameter growth.* There was no effect with respect to either the treatment or the planting distance from the large trees but *Dryobalanops lanceolata* seedlings showed



significantly greater relative diameter growth rates than *Shorea parvifolia* seedlings ( $F_{1,238}=10.2$ ,  $P<0.01$ ; Figure 2 and Table 4, Figure S4).

*Height growth.* There was no effect of connection to an EcM network or species on height growth. However, the root exclusion (-R) treatment of *Dryobalanops lanceolata* showed a 73% increase in height growth rate when planted close to a large tree compared to those that were planted away from the tree ( $t_{1,238}=2.5$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) (Table 4, Figure S5 a and b).

*Leaf growth.* Leaf growth in *Shorea parvifolia* was significantly reduced in the root and mycorrhizal exclusion treatment (-RM) compared to the root exclusion (-R) treatment ( $t_{2,238}=2.4$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) (Table 4, Figure S6 a and b).

*Survival.* A significant treatment effect ( $\chi^2=13.3$ ,  $P=0.001$ ) was found, as seedlings with the root and mycorrhizal exclusion treatment (-RM) showed a lower survival rate than the root exclusion (-R) treatment and the control seedlings. Seedlings of *Dryobalanops lanceolata* showed a significantly higher survival rate compared to *Shorea parvifolia* ( $\chi^2=4.4$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) (Tables 3 and 4).

### Experiment 3

*Diameter growth.* A significant interaction between treatment and soil type ( $F_{3,276}=2.7$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) and between species and soil type ( $F_{3,276}=5.4$ ,  $P<0.01$ ) was found. Seedlings with the root and mycorrhizal exclusion treatment (-RM) of three species (*Parashorea tomentella*, *Shorea beccariana* and *S. multiflora*) grew faster in the sandstone soil type compared to seedlings with only the root exclusion treatment (-R). Seedlings of

*Dryobalanops lanceolata* with the root exclusion treatment (-R) grew marginally faster on the alluvial soil type ( $t_{1,285}=1.7$ ,  $P<0.10$ ) and also showed more rapid growth compared to seedlings with the root and mycorrhizal exclusion treatment (-RM) ( $t_{1,285}=2.2$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) (Figure 3 and Table 5, Figure S7).

*Height growth.* Seedlings of all four dipterocarp species showed significantly different height growth rates ( $F_{3,276} = 3.6$ ,  $P<0.05$ ). *Parashorea tomentella* seedlings with the root exclusion treatment (-R) grew faster on the sandstone soil type ( $t_{1,276}=2.1$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) (Table 5, Figure S8 a and b).

*Leaf growth.* A significant interaction between species and soil type was observed for relative leaf growth rates ( $F_{3,276} = 4.7$ ,  $P<0.01$ ). *Dryobalanops lanceolata* seedlings grew significantly faster on the alluvial compared to the sandstone soil type ( $t_{1,276}=2.0$ ,  $P<0.05$ ); for all other species there were no differences between the soil types (Table 5, Figure S9 a and b).

*Survival.* A marginal species effect ( $\chi^2=7.2$ ,  $P<0.10$ ) and a significant soil type effect ( $\chi^2=6.0$ ,  $P=0.01$ ) were found, however no effect of the treatments was observed after 15 months (Tables 3 and 5). Notably, the sandstone specialists *Shorea beccariana* and *S. multiflora* showed lower survival rates on alluvial soil but the species by soil type interaction was not significant.

#### Experiment 4

There was no difference between the foliar  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of seedlings grown in trenched ( $-35.05\text{‰} \pm 0.22 \text{ SE}$ ) or untrenched ( $-35.00\text{‰} \pm 0.22 \text{ SE}$ ) plots but both were

significantly more negative than the value of  $-30.31\% \pm 0.34$  SE obtained from the canopy leaves of large trees ( $F_{2,45}=79.06$ ,  $P<0.001$ ). No effect of the treatment (trenched vs. untrenched) on seedling survival rate was observed (Table 3).

## Discussion

Several studies have addressed the benefits to seedlings of tropical forest trees of being in contact with EcM hyphae radiating out from tree roots (Alexander et al. 1992; Yasman 1995; Newbery et al. 2000), but few have tested the importance of incorporation into a common EcM network under field conditions. Two independent prior studies by Onguene and Kuyper (2002) and McGuire (2007) reported significant increases in seedling mass (35%) and height growth (73%) respectively, that they related to incorporation into the EcM networks of Caesalpinioideae trees in studies in Cameroon and Guyana, respectively. In contrast, the key result from our analysis across four complementary experiments with dipterocarps in South-east Asia is that there are minimal effects of experimentally imposed treatments that alter seedling incorporation into an EcM hyphal network on measures of dipterocarp seedling growth in understorey conditions. Only two growth measures (the number of leaves of *Shorea parvifolia* in Experiment 2 and the diameter of *Dryobalanops lanceolata* in Experiment 3) suggested any importance of an EcM hyphal network. There was some evidence that exclusion from the EcM network reduced seedling survival, as, in Experiment 2, seedling survival was lower in the –RM treatment compared to the –R treatment and the control, although there is the possibility that this was due to waterlogging. In our combined studies we thus did not detect any benefit to seedlings from being connected, through a common EcM network, to surrounding mature trees.

We suggest that the lack of any effect on seedling growth of being connected to an EcM network, in contrast to boreo-temperate forests (Simard et al. 2012) and low diversity tropical forest (McGuire 2007) is because our lowland dipterocarp forest study sites have high tree diversity and low species preference of EcM fungi. Peay et al. (2015) showed ‘extreme host generalism’ of EcM fungi in similar tropical forests in northern Borneo and it has been found that there is little evidence for host preference by EcM fungal species in other tropical forests with high diversity of trees and a substantial proportion of EcM trees (Tedersoo et al. 2010; Diédhiou et al. 2010; Smith et al. 2011). If considered from a phytocentric perspective, an absence of host-specific EcM associations removes the selective advantage of supporting seedlings *via* an EcM hyphal network because there can be no guarantee that the supported seedling would be conspecific kin.

Overall, the majority of measurements showed no effect (positive or negative) of inclusion into an EcM network on seedling growth. However, in some cases, experiment-specific findings argue for species-specific growth patterns, sometimes even across the experiments. *Parashorea tomentella* seedlings in Experiments 1 and 3 showed increased growth rates when isolated from a common EcM network, suggesting that EcM networks could even have detrimental effects on seedling growth and survival. Two additional species (*Shorea beccariana* and *S. multiflora*) showed this effect in Experiment 3 but only on the sandstone soil type. This result may not be entirely related to an EcM network but in this case we hypothesise that providing exclusive access to EcM hyphae associated with the seedlings to the rooting space inside the mesh tubes prevented competition with hyphae from outside. It could also indicate that the artificially induced limitation of root competition over scarce resources could be

466 directly beneficial for seedling growth (Coomes and Grubb 2000). Furthermore, there  
467 was some evidence in Experiment 1 that fungicide addition limited diameter and leaf  
468 growth in *Hopea nervosa*, but not in *Parashorea tomentella*. Fungicide addition  
469 reduced the growth rate of this one species even though there was no significant  
470 reduction in EcM colonisation (Brearley 2003). Clearly, the application of fungicide  
471 will have additional effects other than simply reducing EcM colonisation such as effects  
472 on soil nutrient status and impacts on pathogenic fungal populations (Newsham et al.  
473 1994; Brearley 2003; Teste et al. 2006). In a similar experiment under high light  
474 conditions (gaps), Brearley (2003) found that fungicide addition did reduce EcM  
475 colonisation but this had a greater impact on seedling nutrient status than on seedling  
476 growth. Other aspects of our experimental manipulations that may not have created  
477 seedlings that were entirely disconnected from an EcM network include the depth of  
478 barriers that were variable among experiment designs (*i.e.* possibly too shallow in  
479 Experiment 4) and their open-bottomed nature in some experiments that might have  
480 allowed colonisation by EcM hyphae from deeper soil layers (Pickles and Pither 2014).  
481 In addition, there is the possibility of confounding the experimental treatments with  
482 colonisation by different EcM fungal species; seedling roots isolated from the EcM  
483 network would be more likely to be colonised by spore-forming fungi (and perhaps  
484 retain initial greenhouse colonising fungi for longer) whereas those connected to the  
485 EcM network would be more likely to become colonised via hyphal connections.  
486 However, despite the potential for priority effects (Kennedy et al. 2009), there is a rapid  
487 turnover of the EcM community on dipterocarp seedlings (Chang et al. 1994,1995; Lee  
488 and Alexander 1996). Indeed, it would have been highly beneficial to have determined  
489 the EcM fungi present on the seedlings' roots in each of the treatments (both at the  
490 beginning and end of the experiments), in addition to those on adult trees, to provide

491 additional support for the efficacy of our experimental manipulations, as well as  
492 comparing our different experimental designs. Importantly, it would also provide  
493 support for our hypothesis of low EcM host specificity and this should be the key target  
494 of future research.

495  
496       Whilst we do not question the benefit to seedlings coming into contact with  
497 EcM hyphae already present in the soil allowing them to rapidly form EcM associations  
498 (Alexander et al. 1992), we did not find any importance of the EcM network for growth  
499 of seedlings although survival was affected in one experiment. Whilst the main  
500 mechanism through which connections to an EcM network have been hypothesised to  
501 benefit seedlings is the provisioning of carbon for seedling growth in low light  
502 environments, it could be questioned whether incorporation into an EcM network  
503 provides other benefits that we have not measured. These could include improved  
504 resistance to herbivores (Booth 2004), drought tolerance through hydraulic uplift  
505 (Egerton-Warburton et al. 2007; Bingham and Simard 2011), or access to nutrients  
506 being taken up from a larger volume of soil - possibly being more important where light  
507 is less limiting. Bingham and Simard (2011) found a greater importance of an EcM  
508 network under drought conditions; our sites rarely experience drought but it could be  
509 informative to test the effect of EcM networks under an experimentally induced drought  
510 or along a climatic gradient. Under very low light conditions, such that light was highly  
511 limiting to growth (i.e. below the light compensation point), seedling survival is  
512 arguably more important than seedling growth in determining future community  
513 composition. In our experiment, light levels were above the light compensation point  
514 for seedling growth (Eschenbach et al. 1998) such that growth was a more relevant  
515 measure than survival although we did see some suggestions that the EcM network was

important for seedling survival. We altered light conditions by removal of some vegetation - this might have influenced our results but as the majority of these would have been AM species the impact of this is considered minor. An isotope labelling study ( $^{13}\text{C}$ ) would be the next step to truly confirm if this lack of importance of an EcM hyphal network is indeed the case although, clearly, this is logistically challenging (Philip and Simard 2008, but see Klein et al. 2016).

In conclusion, we found that incorporation into a common EcM network has few measurable beneficial effects on dipterocarp seedling growth. That is not to say that the EcM network is unimportant, but, that within the constraints of short-term experiments ( $< 2 \frac{1}{2}$  years), we could not detect a signal of its influence on seedling growth. We did determine suggestions of an effect on seedling survival but this was only in one experiment and may have been an experimental artefact. We recommend that further studies should focus on the role that EcM networks play in resilience to drought periods or nutrient limitation of dipterocarp seedlings. In addition, we propose a working hypothesis, that needs further experimental testing, that the high tree species diversity and lack of benefit to trees of supporting heterospecific seedlings through a generalist EcM network is the reason for the minimal effects seen here. We welcome additional experiments and note that they need to be supported by identification of EcM fungi on seedling roots to aid interpretation. Currently, incorporation into an EcM network cannot categorically be invoked as affecting dipterocarp seedling growth or determining patterns of community diversity in dipterocarp-dominated tropical forests of Borneo.

## **Acknowledgements**

For assistance with experimental design, fieldwork and comments on earlier versions of the manuscript we thank: Udin bin Ladin and the Malua field station team, Adzimi Madran, Adzley Madran, Justin Tabai, Dainold Yudat, Daulin Yudat, Rineson Yudat, Karin Saner, Ian Alexander, Yann Hautier, Jan Jansa, Lee Su See, Robert Ong, Malcolm Press and Glen Reynolds. This research is manuscript no. 15 of the Sabah Biodiversity Experiment and part of the Royal Society South-East Asia Rainforest Research Programme (Project No. RS243). All experiments complied with the laws of the country they were conducted in (Malaysia) at the time of the studies.

This project was financially supported through the British Ecological Society, the Ishizaka Foundation, the Darwin Initiative (United Kingdom Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs) and the University of Zürich.

## **Disclosure statement**

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest. The authors acknowledge that they have no financial interest or benefit arising from the direct applications of this research.

## **Notes on Contributors**

**Francis Q. Brearley** is an ecologist interested in the functional importance of plant-soil interactions for ecological processes in tropical forests

**Philippe Saner** is an environmental scientist with a main interest in tropical plant community ecology and the restoration of tropical forests



565 **Ayuhō Uchida** was a Ph.D. student examining the importance of root competition and  
 566 ectomycorrhizal fungi for dipterocarp seedling growth

567 **David F.R.P. Burslem** is interested in the community and ecosystem ecology of  
 568 tropical forests with a particular focus on the maintenance of species diversity and the  
 569 conservation of tropical forests

570 **Andy Hector** is a community ecologist interested in biodiversity loss and its  
 571 consequences for the stability and functioning of ecosystems and the provision of  
 572 ecological services

573 **Reuben Nilus** is an ecologist working on the diversity, distribution and conservation of  
 574 the forests of Sabah

575 **Julie D. Scholes** is a physiologist/molecular biologist interested in the role of pathogens  
 576 and mycorrhizas in the maintenance of dipterocarp diversity in tropical forests

577 **Simon Egli** has a main interest in mycorrhizal fungi and how they support the  
 578 resistance and resilience of forest ecosystems in a changing environment

579

## 580 **References**

- 581 Alexander IJ, Ahmad N, Lee SS. 1992. The role of mycorrhizas in the regeneration of  
 582 some Malaysian forest trees. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of*  
 583 *London Series B-Biological Sciences* 335:357–367.
- 584 Ashton PS. 2004. Dipterocarpaceae. In: Soepadmo E, Saw LG, Chung RCK (editors).  
 585 *Tree Flora of Sabah and Sarawak. Volume 5. Sandakan, Kepong, Kuching*  
 586 *(Malaysia): Sabah Forestry Department, Forest Research Institute Malaysia and*  
 587 *Sarawak Forestry Department. p. 63–388.*
- 588 Baillie IC, Mamit JD. 1983. Observations on rooting in mixed dipterocarp forest,  
 589 central Sarawak. *Malaysian Forester* 46:369–374.
- 590 Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker BM, Walker SC. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models  
 591 using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* arXiv:1406.5823.

592 Beiler KJ, Durall, Simard SW, Maxwell SA, Kretzer AM. 2010. Architecture of the  
 593 wood-wide web: *Rhizopogon* spp. genets link multiple Douglas-fir cohorts. New  
 594 Phytologist 185:543-553.

595 Bingham MA, Simard, SW 2011. Do mycorrhizal network benefits to survival and  
 596 growth of interior Douglas-fir seedlings increase with soil moisture stress?  
 597 Ecology and Evolution 1:306-316.

598 Booth MG. 2004. Mycorrhizal networks mediate overstorey-understorey competition in  
 599 a temperate forest. Ecology Letters 7:538–546.

600 Brearley FQ. 2003. The Role of Ectomycorrhizas in the Regeneration of Dipterocarp  
 601 Seedlings [Doctoral Thesis]. [Sheffield]: University of Sheffield.

602 Brearley FQ, Press MC, Scholes JD. 2003. Nutrients obtained from leaf litter can  
 603 improve the growth of dipterocarp seedlings. New Phytologist 160:101–110.

604 Brearley FQ. 2006. Differences in the growth and ectomycorrhizal community of  
 605 *Dryobalanops lanceolata* (Dipterocarpaceae) seedlings grown in ultramafic and  
 606 non-ultramafic soils. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 38:3407–3410.

607 Brearley FQ, Proctor J, Suriantata Nagy L, Dalrymple G, Voysey BC. 2007a.  
 608 Reproductive phenology over a 10-year period in a lowland evergreen rain forest  
 609 of central Borneo. Journal of Ecology 95:828–839.

610 Brearley FQ, Scholes JD, Press MC, Palfner G. 2007b. How does light and phosphorus  
 611 fertilisation affect the growth and ectomycorrhizal community of two contrasting  
 612 dipterocarp species? Plant Ecology 192:237–249.

613 Brearley FQ. 2011. The importance of ectomycorrhizas for the growth of dipterocarps  
 614 and the efficacy of ectomycorrhizal inoculation schemes. In: Rai M, Varma A  
 615 (editors). Diversity and Biotechnology of Ectomycorrhizae. Berlin (Germany):  
 616 Springer-Verlag. p. 3–17.

617 Brearley FQ. 2012. Ectomycorrhizal associations of the Dipterocarpaceae. Biotropica  
 618 44:637–648.

619 Buchmann N, Guehl JM, Barigah TS, Ehleringer JR. 1997. Interseasonal comparison of  
 620 CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, isotopic composition, and carbon dynamics in an Amazonian  
 621 rainforest (French Guiana). Oecologia 110:120–131.

622 Chang YS, Lapeyrie FF, Lee SS. 1994. The survival and competitiveness of *Pisolithus*  
 623 *tinctorius* on outplanted seedlings of *Shorea glauca* in Malaysia. In: S Appanah,  
 624 KC Khoo (editors). Proceedings of the Fifth Round Table Conference on  
 625 Dipterocarps. Kepong (Malaysia): Forest Research Institute. p. 165–169.

- 626 Chang YS, Lee SS, Lapeyrie FF, Yazid SM. 1995. The competitiveness of two strains  
627 of *Pisolithus tinctorius* on seedlings of three species of dipterocarps under nursery  
628 and field conditions: preliminary results. In: Wickneswari R, Yahya AZ, Shariff  
629 AHM, Haji Ahmad D, Khoo KC, Suzuki K, Sakurai S, Ishii K (editors).  
630 Proceedings of the International Workshop of BIO-REFOR, Kangar, 1994. Tokyo  
631 (Japan) & Kepong (Malaysia): BIO-REFOR, IUFRO-SPDC & Forest Research  
632 Institute Malaysia. p. 208–212.
- 633 Connell JH, Lowman MD. 1989. Low-diversity tropical rain forests: some possible  
634 mechanisms for their existence. *The American Naturalist* 134:88–119.
- 635 Coomes DA, Grubb PJ. 2000. Impacts of root competition on forests and woodlands: a  
636 theoretical framework and review of experiments. *Ecological Monographs*  
637 70:171–207.
- 638 Curran LM, Caniago I, Paoli GD, Astianti D, Kusneti M, Leighton M, Nirarita CE,  
639 Haeruman H. 1999. Impact of El Niño and logging on canopy tree recruitment in  
640 Borneo. *Science* 286:2184–2188.
- 641 Dent DH, Bagchi R, Robinson D, Majalap-Lee N, Burslem DFRP. 2006. Nutrient  
642 fluxes via litterfall and leaf litter decomposition vary across a gradient of soil  
643 nutrient supply in a lowland tropical rain forest. *Plant and Soil* 288:197–215.
- 644 Diédhiou AG, Selosse M-A, Galiana A, Diabaté M, Dreyfus B, Bâ AM, de Faria SM,  
645 Béna G. 2010. Multi-host ectomycorrhizal fungi are predominant in a Guinean  
646 tropical rainforest and shared between canopy trees and seedlings. *Environmental*  
647 *Microbiology* 8:2219–2232.
- 648 Egerton-Warburton LM, Querejeta JJ, Allen MF. 2007. Common mycorrhizal networks  
649 provide a potential pathway for the transfer of hydraulically lifted water between  
650 plants. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 58:1473–1483.
- 651 Eschenbach C, Glauner R, Kleine M, Kappen L. 1998. Photosynthesis rates of selected  
652 tree species in lowland dipterocarp rainforest of Sabah, Malaysia. *Trees* 12:356–  
653 365.
- 654 Farquhar GD, Ehleringer JR, Hubick KT. 1989. Carbon isotope discrimination and  
655 photosynthesis. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology*  
656 40:503–537.
- 657 Fox JED. 1973. Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve, Sabah Forest Record 9. Malaysia:  
658 Borneo Literature Bureau.
- 659 Francis R, Read DJ. 1984. Direct transfer of carbon between plants connected by

660 vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal mycelium. *Nature* 307:53–56.

661 Frazer GW, Canham CD, Lertzman KP. 1999. Gap Light Analyzer (GLA) Version 2.0:  
 662 Imaging software to extract canopy structure and gap light transmission indices  
 663 from true-colour fisheye photographs, users manual and program documentation.  
 664 Burnaby, British Columbia (USA) & Millbrook, New York (USA): Simon Fraser  
 665 University, & The Institute of Ecosystem Studies.

666 Hector A, von Felten S, Schmid B. 2010. Analysis of variance with unbalanced data: an  
 667 update for ecology & evolution. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 79:308–316.

668 Hector A, Philipson CD, Saner P, Chamagne J, Dzulkipli D, O'Brien M, Snaddon JL,  
 669 Ulok P, Weilenmann M, Reynolds G, et al. 2011. The Sabah Biodiversity  
 670 Experiment: a long-term test of the role of tree diversity in restoring tropical  
 671 forest structure and functioning. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society  
 672 of London Series B-Biological Sciences* 366:3303–3315.

673 Hector A. 2015. *The New Statistics with R*. Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press.

674 Heinemeyer A, Hartley IP, Evans SP, Carreira de la Fuente JA, Ineson P. 2007. Forest  
 675 soil CO<sub>2</sub> flux: uncovering the contribution and environmental responses of  
 676 ectomycorrhizas. *Global Change Biology* 13:1786–1797.

677 Johnson D, Leake JR, Read DJ. 2001. Novel in-growth core system enables functional  
 678 studies of grassland mycorrhizal mycelial networks. *New Phytologist* 152:555–  
 679 562.

680 Katayama A, Kume T, Komatsu H, Ohashi M, Nakagawa M, Yamashita M, Otsuki K,  
 681 Suzuki M, Kumagai T. 2009. Effect of forest structure on the spatial variation in  
 682 soil respiration in a Bornean tropical rainforest. *Agricultural and Forest  
 683 Meteorology* 149:1666–1673.

684 Kennedy P, Peay KG, Bruns TD. 2009. Root tip competition among ectomycorrhizal  
 685 fungi: are priority effects a rule or an exception? *Ecology* 90:2098–2107.

686 Klein T, Siegwolf RTW, Körner C. 2016. Belowground carbon trade among tall trees in  
 687 a temperate forest. *Science* 352:342–344.

688 Lee SS, Alexander IJ. 1996. The dynamics of ectomycorrhizal infection of *Shorea*  
 689 *leprosula* seedlings in Malaysian rain forests. *New Phytologist* 132:297–305.

690 Marsh CW, Greer AG. 1992. Forest land-use in Sabah, Malaysia: an introduction to  
 691 Danum Valley. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series  
 692 B-Biological Sciences* 335:331–339.

693 McGuire KL. 2007. Common ectomycorrhizal networks may maintain monodominance  
694 in a tropical rain forest. *Ecology* 88:567–574.

695 Medina E, Minchin P. 1980. Stratification of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of leaves in Amazonian rain  
696 forests. *Oecologia* 45:377–378.

697 Medina E, Montes G, Cuevas E, Rokzandic Z. 1986. Profiles of  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration and  
698  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values in tropical rain forests of the upper Rio Negro Basin, Venezuela.  
699 *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 2:207–217.

700 Medina E, Sternberg L, Cuevas E. 1991. Vertical stratification of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values in closed  
701 natural and plantation forests in the Luquillo mountains, Puerto Rico. *Oecologia*  
702 87:369–372.

703 Meijer W, Wood GHS. 1964. Dipterocarps of Sabah (North Borneo), Sabah Forest  
704 Record 5. Sandakan (Malaysia): Forest Department.

705 Michaëlla Ebenye HC, Taudière A, Niang N, Ndiaye C, Sauve M, Onguene Awana N,  
706 Verbeken M, De Kesel A, Séné S, Diédhiou AG, Sarda V, Sadio O, Cissoko M,  
707 Ndoye I, Selosse M-A, Bâ AM. in press. Ectomycorrhizal fungi are shared  
708 between seedlings and adults in a monodominant *Gilbertiodendron dewevrei* rain  
709 forest in Cameroon. *Biotropica*.

710 Newbery DM, Alexander IJ, Rother JA. 2000. Does proximity to conspecific adults  
711 influence the establishment of ectomycorrhizal trees in rain forest? *New*  
712 *Phytologist* 147:401–409.

713 Newman MF, Burgess PF Whitmore TC. 1996. *Manuals of Dipterocarps for Foresters:*  
714 *Borneo Island Light Hardwoods*. Edinburgh (UK): Royal Botanic Garden.

715 Newman MF, Burgess PF Whitmore TC. 1998. *Manuals of Dipterocarps for Foresters:*  
716 *Borneo Island Medium and Heavy Hardwoods*. Edinburgh (UK): Royal Botanic  
717 Garden.

718 Newsham KK, Fitter AH, Watkinson AR. 1994. Root pathogenic and arbuscular  
719 mycorrhizal fungi determine fecundity of asymptomatic plants in the field.  
720 *Journal of Ecology* 82:805–814.

721 Nilus R. 2004. *Effect of Edaphic Variation on Forest Structure, Dynamics, Diversity*  
722 *and Regeneration in a Lowland Tropical Rain Forest in Borneo*. [Doctoral Thesis].  
723 [Aberdeen]: University of Aberdeen.

724 O'Leary MH. 1988. Carbon isotopes in photosynthesis. *Bioscience* 38:328–336.

725 Onguene NA, Kuyper TW. 2002. Importance of the ectomycorrhizal network for  
726 seedling survival and ectomycorrhiza formation in rain forests of south Cameroon.

727 Mycorrhiza 12:13–17

728 Paine CET, Stenflo M, Philipson CD, Saner P, Bagchi R, Ong RC, Hector A. 2012a.

729 Differential growth responses in seedlings of ten species of Dipterocarpaceae to

730 experimental shading and defoliation. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 28:377–384.

731 Paine CET, Marthews TR, Vogt DR, Purves D, Rees M, Hector A, Turnbull LA. 2012b.

732 How to fit nonlinear plant growth models and calculate growth rates: an update

733 for ecologists. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3:245–256.

734 Peay KG, Russo SE, McGuire KL, Lim Z, Chan JP, Tan S, Davies SJ. 2015. Lack of

735 host specificity lead to independent assortment of dipterocarps and

736 ectomycorrhizal fungi across a soil fertility gradient. *Ecology Letters* 18:807–816.

737 Philip LJ, Simard SW. 2008. Minimum pulses of stable and radioactive carbon isotopes

738 to detect belowground carbon transfer between plants. *Plant and Soil* 308:23–35.

739 Pickles BJ, Pither J. 2014. Still scratching the surface: how much of the ‘black box’ of

740 soil ectomycorrhizal communities remains in the dark? *New Phytologist*

741 201:1101–1105.

742 Pinheiro JC, Bates DM. 2000. *Mixed-effects Models in S and S-Plus*. New York

743 (USA): Springer Verlag.

744 R Development Core Team. 2015. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical*

745 *Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna (Austria): R

746 Foundation for Statistical Computing.

747 Sakai S, Harrison RD, Momose K, Kuraji K, Nagamasu H, Yasunari T, Chong L,

748 Nakashizuka T. 2006. Irregular droughts trigger mass flowering in aseasonal

749 tropical forests in Asia. *American Journal of Botany* 93:1134–1139.

750 Saner P, Philipson CD, Ong RC, Majalap N, Egli S, Hector A. 2011. Positive effects of

751 ectomycorrhizal colonization on growth of seedlings of a tropical tree across a

752 range of forest floor light conditions. *Plant and Soil* 338:411–421.

753 Saner P, Loh YY, Ong RC, Hector A. 2012. Carbon stocks and fluxes in tropical

754 lowland dipterocarp rainforests in Sabah, Malaysian Borneo. *PLoS One* 7:e29642.

755 Simard SW, Perry DA, Jones MD, Myrold DD, Durall DM, Molina R. 1997. Net

756 transfer of carbon between ectomycorrhizal tree species in the field. *Nature*

757 388:579–582.

758 Simard SW, Beiler KJ, Bingham MA, Deslippe JR, Philip LJ, Teste FP. 2012.

759 Mycorrhizal networks: mechanisms, ecology and modeling. *Fungal Biology*

760 *Reviews* 26:39–60.

761 Slik JWF, Poulsen AD, Ashton PS, Cannon CH, Eichhorn KAO, Kartawinata K,  
762 Lanniari I, Nagamasu H, Nakagawa M, van Nieuwstadt MGL, et al. 2003. A  
763 floristic analysis of the lowland dipterocarp forests of Borneo. *Journal of*  
764 *Biogeography* 30:1517–1531.

765 Slik JWF, Raes N, Aiba SI, Brearley FQ, Cannon CH, Meijaard, E, Nagamasu H, Nilus  
766 R, Paoli G, Poulsen AD, Sheil D, Suzuki E, van Valkenburg JLCH, Webb CO,  
767 Wilkie P, Wulfraat S. 2009. Environmental correlates for tropical tree diversity  
768 and distribution patterns in Borneo. *Diversity and Distributions* 15:523–532.

769 Smith ME, Henkel TW, Aime MC, Fremier A, Vilgalys R. 2011. Ectomycorrhizal  
770 fungal diversity and community structure on three co-occurring leguminous  
771 canopy tree species in a Neotropical rainforest. *New Phytologist* 192:699–712.

772 Smith SE, Read DJ. 2008. *Mycorrhizal Symbiosis*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. London (UK): Academic  
773 Press.

774 Tedersoo L, Sadam A, Zambrano M, Valencia R, Bahram M. 2010. Low diversity and  
775 high host preference of ectomycorrhizal fungi in Western Amazonia, a neotropical  
776 biodiversity hotspot. *The ISME Journal* 4:465–746.

777 Teste FP, Karst J, Jones MD, Simard SW, Durall DM. 2006. Methods to control  
778 ectomycorrhizal colonization: effectiveness of chemical and physical barriers.  
779 *Mycorrhiza* 17:51–65.


780 Vallack HW, Leronni V, Metcalfe DB, Högberg P, Ineson P, Subke J-A. 2012.  
781 Application of nitrogen fertilizer to a boreal pine forest has a negative impact on  
782 the respiration of ectomycorrhizal hyphae. *Plant and Soil* 352:405–417.

783 van der Heijden, MGA, Sanders IR. 2002. *Mycorrhizal Ecology*, *Ecological Studies* 157.  
784 Berlin (Germany): Springer-Verlag.

785 Yasman I. 1995. *Dipterocarpaceae: Tree-Mycorrhizae-Seedling Connections*. [Doctoral  
786 Thesis]. Wageningen: University of Wageningen.


**Figure legends**

**Figure 1:** Effect of fungicide addition, but no effect of exclusion from an ectomycorrhizal hyphal network on the relative diameter growth rate (RGR) of two species of dipterocarp seedlings (top: *Hopea nervosa* and bottom: *Parashorea tomentella*) over a 24-month period at Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve in Sabah (Malaysian Borneo). The box indicates the data range from the lower quartile (25%) to the upper quartile (75%) and covers 50% of the data with the solid horizontal line within the box indicating the median. Whiskers indicate the data range from the lower 10% to the upper 90% (1.5 times the lower or upper quartile); outliers are indicated separately with a dot. See text for full details of experimental treatments.






**Figure 2:** No effect of exclusion from an ectomycorrhizal hyphal network on the relative diameter growth rate (RGR) of two species of dipterocarp seedlings by distance from adult tree (top: *Dryobalanops lanceolata* and bottom: *Shorea parvifolia*) over an 11-month period at Malua Forest Reserve in Sabah (Malaysian Borneo). The box indicates the data range from the lower quartile (25%) to the upper quartile (75%) and covers 50% of the data with the solid horizontal line within the box indicating the median. Whiskers indicate the data range from the lower 10% to the upper 90% (1.5 times the lower or upper quartile); outliers are indicated separately with a dot. See text for full details of experimental treatments.



**Figure 3:** No effect of exclusion from an ectomycorrhizal hyphal network on the relative diameter growth rate (RGR) of four species of dipterocarp seedlings (top: *Dryobalanops lanceolata*, middle top: *Parashorea tomentella*, middle bottom: *Shorea beccariana* and bottom: *Shorea multiflora*) across soil types over a 29-month period at Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve in Sabah (Malaysian Borneo). Note that *S. beccariana* and *S. multiflora* growing in the alluvial soil type were harvested after 15 months due to high mortality rates. The box indicates the data range from the lower quartile (25%) to the upper quartile (75%) and covers 50% of the data with the solid horizontal line within the box indicating the median. Whiskers indicate the data range from the lower 10% to the upper 90% (1.5 times the lower or upper quartile); outliers are indicated separately with a dot. See text for full details of experimental treatments.



**Table 1:** Ecological information on seedlings of six dipterocarp species used to experimentally assess the important of incorporation into a common EcM network on seedling growth in tropical forests of Malaysian Borneo.

Name	Size	Wood density	Distribution	Experiment(s)
<i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i>	Very large emergent	Medium / heavy	Common on fertile clay-rich soils in lowland northern Borneo	2,3
<i>Hopea nervosa</i>	Medium-sized	Heavy	Locally common in eastern Sabah	1
<i>Parashorea tomentella</i>	Large emergent	Light	Locally common on fertile lowland soils with occasional flooding (only on the east coast of northern Borneo)	1,3
<i>Shorea beccariana</i>	Medium-sized to large	Light	Common in northern Borneo on sandy soils and particularly ridge-tops associated with sandstone rocks.	3
<i>Shorea multiflora</i>	Small to medium-sized	Light	Common throughout Borneo on nutrient-poor or sandy soils and coastal hill slopes.	3,4
<i>Shorea parvifolia</i>	Large emergent	Light	Common throughout Borneo on better-drained clay soils.	2

Information collated from Ashton (2004), Meijer and Wood (1964), Newman *et al.* (1996, 1998) and personal observations.

**Table 2:** Experiment 1: Statistical summary table and biological interpretation of exclusion from an ectomycorrhizal hyphal network on relative growth rates (diameter, height and number of leaves) and survival for two species of dipterocarp seedlings (*Hopea nervosa* and *Parashorea tomentella*) over a 24-month period at Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve in Sabah (Malaysian Borneo). -R = Root exclusion, -RM = Root and ectomycorrhiza exclusion, -RM+F = Root and ectomycorrhiza exclusion plus fungicide addition.

Effect	$F_{df}$	$P$	Interpretation
<b>Diameter</b>			
Treatment	$F_{4,220}=12.8$	<0.0001	-RM+F reduced growth of <i>Hopea nervosa</i> -RM treatment showed faster growth rate compared to -R in <i>Parashorea tomentella</i>
Species	$F_{1,220}=19.2$	<0.0001	Seedlings of <i>Parashorea tomentella</i> grew faster than <i>Hopea nervosa</i>
Treatment x Species	$F_{4,220}=2.7$	<0.05	Slower growth with =RM+F for <i>Hopea nervosa</i> but not <i>Parashorea tomentella</i>
<b>Height</b>			
Treatment	$F_{4,220}=1.4$	ns	No ectomycorrhizal network effect
Species	$F_{1,220}=4.1$	<0.05	<i>Parashorea tomentella</i> grew faster than <i>Hopea nervosa</i>
Treatment x Species	$F_{4,220}=0.8$	ns	No significant interaction term
<b>Leaves</b>			
Treatment	$F_{4,220}=5.0$	<0.001	<i>Hopea nervosa</i> control seedlings grew faster than -R and -RM -RM+F significantly reduced growth in <i>Hopea nervosa</i>
Species	$F_{1,220}=116.3$	<0.0001	<i>Hopea nervosa</i> seedlings grew faster than <i>Parashorea tomentella</i> seedlings
Treatment x Species	$F_{4,220}=1.8$	ns	No significant interaction term
<b>Survival</b>			
Treatment	$\chi^2_{3,7}=4.0$	ns	No effect of treatment on survival
Species	$\chi^2_{6,7}=6.4$	<0.01	Seedlings of <i>Hopea nervosa</i> showed higher survival compared to <i>Parashorea tomentella</i>
Treatment x Species	$\chi^2_{7,11}=4.2$	ns	No significant interaction term

832 **Table 3:** Survival rates (%) of dipterocarp seedlings following exclusion from an  
833 ectomycorrhizal hyphal network in four independent experiments conducted in Borneo.  
834 See text for full details of experimental set-up in each experiment. Dash (-) indicates  
835 that the treatment noted was not present in the given experiment. Asterisk (\*) indicates  
836 15 months to harvest whilst all other values are for the entire experimental period. -R =  
837 Root exclusion, -RM = Root and ectomycorrhiza exclusion, -RM+F = Root and  
838 ectomycorrhiza exclusion plus fungicide addition.

	Control	Sub-Control	-R	-RM	-RM+F
<b>Experiment 1</b>					
<i>Parashorea tomentella</i>	79	83	80	71	80
<i>Hopea nervosa</i>	96	92	100	88	83
<b>Experiment 2</b>					
Near					
<i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i>	98	-	97	95	-
<i>Shorea parvifolia</i>	98	-	97	89	-
Far					
<i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i>	99	-	100	97	-
<i>Shorea parvifolia</i>	98	-	98	90	-
<b>Experiment 3</b>					
Alluvial					
<i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i>	50	70	60	70	-
<i>Shorea beccariana</i>	30*	30*	30*	20*	-
<i>Shorea multiflora</i>	20*	30*	40*	10*	-
<i>Parashorea tomentella</i>	20	20	40	20	-
Sandstone					
<i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i>	40	40	50	60	-
<i>Shorea beccariana</i>	60	60	40	30	-
<i>Shorea multiflora</i>	50	30	40	30	-
<i>Parashorea tomentella</i>	40	70	60	30	-
<b>Experiment 4</b>					
<i>Shorea multiflora</i>	92	-	-	88	-

839

**Table 4:** Experiment 2: Statistical summary table and biological interpretation of exclusion from an ectomycorrhizal hyphal network and distance from adult tree on relative growth rates (diameter, height and number of leaves) and survival for two species of dipterocarp seedlings (*Dryobalanops lanceolata* and *Shorea parvifolia*) over an 11-month period at the Malua Forest Reserve in Sabah (Malaysian Borneo). Interaction terms not included were not statistically significant for any of the parameters measured. -R = Root exclusion, -RM = Root and ectomycorrhiza exclusion.

Effect	$F_{df}$	$P$	Interpretation
<b>Diameter</b>			
Treatment	$F_{2,238}=0.6$	ns	No ectomycorrhizal network effect
Distance	$F_{1,238}=1.1$	ns	No effect of distance from adult tree
Species	$F_{1,238}=10.2$	<0.01	<i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i> grew faster than <i>Shorea parvifolia</i>
Treatment x Species	$F_{2,238}=0.3$	ns	No significant interaction term
<b>Height</b>			
Treatment	$F_{2,238}=1.2$	ns	No ectomycorrhizal network effect
Distance	$F_{1,238}=9.3$	<0.01	<i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i> grew faster closer to adult trees
Species	$F_{1,238}=0.1$	ns	No species differences
Treatment x Species	$F_{2,238}=2.5$	<0.10	<i>Shorea parvifolia</i> control seedlings grew marginally faster than -R and significantly faster than -RM but no effect on <i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i>
<b>Leaves</b>			
Treatment	$F_{2,238}=3.1$	<0.05	<i>Shorea parvifolia</i> -RM seedlings grew slower than the -R treatment
Distance	$F_{1,238}=0.9$	ns	No effect of distance from adult tree
Species	$F_{1,238}=0.1$	ns	No species differences
Treatment x Species	$F_{2,238}=3.2$	<0.05	<i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i> -RM seedlings grew slower, but no effect on <i>Shorea parvifolia</i>
<b>Survival</b>			
Treatment	$\chi^2_{3,5}=13.3$	<0.0001	-RM showed significantly lower survival for both species
Distance	$\chi^2_{5,6}=1.0$	ns	No effect of distance from adult tree
Species	$\chi^2_{4,5}=4.4$	<0.05	Survival rate in <i>Shorea parvifolia</i> lower than in <i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i>
Treatment x Species	$\chi^2_{5,7}=0.4$	ns	No significant interaction term

**Table 5:** Experiment 3: Statistical summary table and biological interpretation of exclusion from an ectomycorrhizal hyphal network and soil type on relative growth rates (diameter, height and number of leaves) for four species of dipterocarp seedlings (*Dryobalanops lanceolata*, *Parashorea tomentella*, *Shorea beccariana* and *Shorea multiflora*) over a 29-month period at Kabili-Sepilok Forest Reserve in Sabah (Malaysian Borneo). The three-way interaction term is not included as it was not statistically significant for any of the parameters measured. -R = Root exclusion, -RM = Root and ectomycorrhiza exclusion.

Effect	$F_{df}$	$P$	Interpretation
<b>Diameter</b>			
Treatment	$F_{3,276}=2.6$	<0.10	See interactions below
Soil type	$F_{1,276}=0.8$	ns	No soil type effect
Species	$F_{3,276}=0.8$	ns	No species effect
Treatment x Species	$F_{9,276}=1.3$	ns	No significant interaction term
Treatment x Soil type	$F_{3,276}=2.7$	<0.05	-RM of <i>Parashorea tomentella</i> , <i>Shorea beccariana</i> and <i>Shorea multiflora</i> grew faster on sandstone soil than -R for all three species
Species x Soil type	$F_{3,276}=5.4$	<0.01	-R of <i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i> grew faster on alluvial soil and overall faster than -RM
<b>Height</b>			
Treatment	$F_{3,276}=1.0$	ns	No ectomycorrhizal network effect
Soil type	$F_{1,276}=0.9$	ns	No soil type effect
Species	$F_{3,276}=3.6$	<0.05	-R of <i>Parashorea tomentella</i> grew faster on sandstone soil
Treatment x Species	$F_{9,276}=1.0$	ns	No significant interaction term
Treatment x Soil type	$F_{3,276}=1.1$	ns	No significant interaction term
Species x Soil type	$F_{3,276}=0.4$	ns	No significant interaction term
<b>Leaves</b>			
Treatment	$F_{3,276}=1.1$	ns	No ectomycorrhizal network effect
Soil type	$F_{1,276}=0.1$	ns	No soil type effect
Species	$F_{3,276}<0.1$	ns	No species effect
Treatment x Species	$F_{9,276}=1.4$	ns	No significant interaction term
Treatment x Soil type	$F_{3,276}=2.0$	ns	No significant interaction term
Species x Soil type	$F_{3,276}=4.7$	<0.01	<i>Dryobalanops lanceolata</i> seedlings grew faster on alluvial soil than sandstone soil
<b>Survival</b>			
Treatment	$\chi^2_{6,9}=1.2$	ns	No effect of treatment on survival
Soil type	$\chi^2_{8,9}=6.0$	<0.01	Survival on alluvial soil was significantly lower compared to sandstone soil
Species	$\chi^2_{6,9}=7.2$	<0.10	Seedlings of <i>Shorea multiflora</i> and <i>Shorea beccariana</i> showed lowest survival after 15 months
Treatment x Species	$\chi^2_{9,18}=4.3$	Ns	No significant interaction term
Treatment x Soil type	$\chi^2_{9,12}=2.3$	ns	No significant interaction term
Species x Soil type	$\chi^2_{9,12}=4.6$	ns	No significant interaction term